

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-13 and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claims 1-3 and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 99/05567 to Johnson et al. (hereinafter "Johnson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,844,533 to Usui et al. (hereinafter "Usui").

Claims 4-6 and 14-16 are allowed.

Claims 7, 9, 17 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant amends claims 1 and 11 by this amendment. Accordingly, claims 1-7, 9, 11-17 and 19 remain pending.

The Disposition of the Claims

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's allowance of claims 4-6 and 14-16, and the Examiner's indication that claims 7, 9, 17 and 19 would be allowable. By this amendment, Applicant amends independent claims 1 and 11 to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7, 9, 17 and 19 are now in condition for allowance.

In addition, claims 1-3 and 11-13 are also believed to be allowable for the following reasons.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-13 and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action asserts that the specification does not provide support for “a standard data,” as set forth in independent claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 11 to address the Examiner’s concerns. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 11 are fully supported by the specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-13 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Usui. To the extent that this rejection might be applied to the claims, as newly-amended, it is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that Johnson and Usui, whether taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1-3 and 11-13, as newly-amended. For instance, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Johnson nor Usui teaches or suggests the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 1, as newly-amended, including at least “determining a data for driving video data normally,” “determining an output data for displaying on the liquid crystal display,” acquiring a modulation data by calculating differences between the normal data and the output data,” and “storing the modulation data in the liquid crystal display.” In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Johnson nor Usui teaches or suggests the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 11, as newly-amended, including at least “a modulator storing a modulation data predetermined by calculating

differences between a data for driving video data normally and an output data for displaying on the liquid crystal display.”

According to an embodiment of the present invention as disclosed, a modulator includes modulation data determined by subtracting normal driving data from data set in advance for a high-speed driving scheme. See, for example, paragraphs [0093]-[0098] of the specification for the present application. In addition, such modulation data may be stored in a look-up table. See, for example, paragraph [0100] of the specification for the present application.

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed combinations, as a whole, no portion of Johnson’s or Usui’s disclosure discusses acquiring a modulation data by calculating difference between a normal data and an output data or a modulation data predetermined by calculating difference between a data for driving video data normally and an output data.

M.P.E.P. §2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” Since Johnson and Usui, whether taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1 and 11, as newly-amended, it is respectfully submitted that Johnson in view of Usui do not render claims 1 and 11 unpatentable. Since claims 2-3 depend on claim 1 and claims 12-13 depend on claim 11, it is respectfully submitted that Johnson in view of Usui also do not render claims 2-3 and 12-13 unpatentable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this

response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: March 22, 2005

By: 

Robert J. Goodell

Registration No. 41,040

Customer No.: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202.739.3000

Facsimile: 202.739.3001